

113 00-982

DDS&T-374-80

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED] Chairman STATINTL
Task Force on Uniform Guidelines on
Employment Selection Procedures

FROM: Deputy Director for Science and Technology

SUBJECT: Task Force Report on Uniform Guidelines on
Employee Selection Procedures

1. I have reviewed the Task Force Report on the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures and feel there are certain points which need clarification and others I believe worthy of comment. Given the importance and magnitude of this issue, the time allotted for review was not adequate. Since there have been no externally imposed deadlines, I strongly urge a cautious and measured approach to this program and suggest that further study be conducted with possible model testing before actual implementation.

2. The following general concerns surfaced during the review of the Task Force Report:

a. Contrary to the Task Force's view, I believe that the highly structured method of collecting and reporting employee selection data would most certainly require diverting a significant amount of resources toward that effort. It would seem logical to develop a computer-based system to process this data in an attempt to minimize the resources required. OPPPM and ODP would be the logical offices to pursue this effort.

b. I question the need and advisability of making the directorate components responsible for applicant flow data when most of the necessary information (i.e. the applicant file) is available through OPPPM. It seems that OPPPM is the better place to collect this data. This would alleviate duplication of reporting. It should be noted that numerous

SUBJECT: Task Force Report on Uniform Guidelines on
Employee Selection Procedures

applicants are considered for employment by more than one component or directorate and in some cases for jobs in more than one occupational grouping. Since this data, for the most part, can be extracted from the official applicant file once it has made its rounds, the best place to do this is in OPPPM. If the data were stored on the computer, OPPPM could then publish monthly computer reports for the directorates and offices thus avoiding the necessity of having the data collected and reported upward for compilation and review.

3. The following comments are related to specific recommendations:

Recommendation 2

A question which might be raised is how to treat statistically those applicants who choose not to complete the self-identification sheet. If significant numbers choose not to complete the form, they would probably be carried as "other", thus seriously eroding the utility of the statistical data. Additionally, if the completed form accompanies the applicant's folder to the selecting components, the potential is that this will prejudice selection decisions in the same way that in the past race and sex information, along with photographs, were deemed potentially prejudicial. I think it makes most sense for OPPPM to remove the form before circulating the file for indications of interest.

Recommendation 3

Some lack of clarity exists with the definition of "applicant" proposed by the Task Force. In many cases the PHS and self-identification sheet will be insufficient to determine if the individual meets the entrance-on-duty qualifications. It appears then that such an individual should not be considered an applicant until he/she has been interviewed.

Recommendation 8

With the understanding that some applicants are disqualified by OMS and OS and a percentage will withdraw their applications, the proposed flow data can reflect unfairly on office of directorate selections. To compensate for this situation, a fourth line might be added, on the Uniform Selection Procedures Summary Report, to each occupational series for reporting drop-outs which occur after processing begins.

SUBJECT: Task Force Report on Uniform Guidelines on
Employee Selection Procedures

Recommendation 10

Clarification is needed because all employees at a grade level are "considered" for promotion at the same time. Some of those "considered" are recent EOD's, those recently promoted, those at the top of their grade scale, or those comparatively ranked too low to progress to higher levels. It should be clearly stated whether information is required on all personnel in a given grade and job category or only those recommended for promotion.

Recommendation 11

If OEE0 and OPPPM review the applicant flow data quarterly, this reporting frequency appears to be quite adequate for directorate reviews as well.

Recommendation 16

An office should be given an opportunity to correct its procedures before a full-scale investigation begins. This could be done by notifying an office that adverse impact is perceived and giving that office a specified number of days to provide a solution to the problem.

Recommendations 18 and 19

I support Alternative Recommendation 18.

The following statement should follow Recommendation 19:
"The Executive Committee will review such appeals. The EC will be supported by the D/OPPPM and the C/PSS serving as non-voting advisors."

It is important to involve senior line managers in this process. It is far better to have the deputies advising the DDCI on a matter so important to their operations (rather than the IG, the GC, and the Comptroller). Further, this avoids creating another board.

SUBJECT: Task Force Report on Uniform Guidelines on
Employee Selection Procedures

Recommendation 25

While the goal of this recommendation is laudable, serious resource implications are apparent. It is difficult to foresee this kind of activity being completed in the near term given the difficulties PMCD encounters in doing the current three-year review.

Recommendation 28

I recommend that the DDA be given this responsibility instead of the General Counsel.

Leslie C. Dirks